•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/603,032	GORDON, GARY G.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Katherine W. Mitchell	3677
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) Katherine W. Mitchell.	(3)	
(2) <u>Thomas Tarolli</u> .	(4)	•
Date of Interview: 13 November 2014	Time: various	·
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.	•	
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1,10		
Prior art documents discussed:		
n/a	• .	
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.	·	
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
	·	
		•
Cathern Mikkell		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Signature	onature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: examiner called to propose an amendment to independent claims 1 and 10 to better define the invention and clarify that the slidable axis was not parallel to the legs, but to the generally planar base, per the attached examiner amendment, which was approved 7/14/2005.